

FRIEDMAN KAPLAN SEILER & ADELMAN LLP

BRUCE S. KAPLAN
EDWARD A. FRIEDMAN
GARY D. FRIEDMAN
BARRY A. ADELMAN
ERIC SEILER
ROBERT D. KAPLAN
ANDREW W. GOLDWATER
ROBERT J. LACK
GREGG S. LERNER
SCOTT M. BERMAN
ERIC CORNGOLD
HAL NEIER
PHILIPPE ADLER
LANCE J. GOTKO
KATHERINE L. PRINGLE
MERYL S. ROSENBLATT
DANIEL B. RAPPORTE
HALLIE B. LEVIN
ANNE E. BEAUMONT
MARY E. MULLIGAN
EMILY A. STUBBS
RICARDO SOLANO JR.
JOHN N. ORSINI
JEFFREY R. WANG
JEFFREY C. FOURMAUX
JASON C. RUBINSTEIN
MICHAEL A. GORDON

7 TIMES SQUARE
NEW YORK, NY 10036-6516
TELEPHONE (212) 833-1100
FACSIMILE (212) 833-1250
WWW.FKLAW.COM
WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL
212-833-1102
WRITER'S DIRECT FAX
212-373-7902
E-MAIL
EFRIEDMAN@FKLAW.COM

RICHARD M. HOFFMAN
SENIOR COUNSEL
—
NORMAN ALPERT
ASAFA REINDEL
COUNSEL
—
STEVEN E. FRANKEL
DANIEL R. GREENBERG
TIMOTHY M. HAGGERTY
CHRISTOPHER M. COLORADO
CHRISTOPHER L. McCALL
YITZCHAK E. SOLOVEICHIK
PEARLINE M. HONG
ERIC J. FINKELSTEIN
JENNIFER A. MUSTES
EMILY L. CHANG
ANDREW M. ENGLANDER
CHARLES E. ENLOE
ALEXANDER D. LEVI
ELIZABETH L. MACCHIAVERNA
SARAH F. FOLEY
JAMUNA D. KELLEY
RAINIA L. NORTICK
MICHAEL S. PALMIERI
ELLIOT CHOI
TANVIR VAHORA
NORA BOJAR
KEVIN J. LIN
ANDREW C. KOSTIC

October 20, 2014

BY E-MAIL

Honorable Thomas P. Griesa
Daniel Patrick Moynihan
United States Courthouse
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007-1312

Re: *NML Capital, Ltd. v. The Republic of Argentina*
Nos. 08 Civ. 6978, 09 Civ. 1707, 09 Civ. 1708
Aurelius Capital Master, Ltd. v. The Republic of Argentina
Nos. 09 Civ. 8757, 09 Civ. 10620, 10 Civ. 3970, 10 Civ. 8339
Aurelius Opportunities Fund II, LLC v. The Republic of Argentina
Nos. 10 Civ. 1602, 10 Civ. 3507
Blue Angel Capital I LLC v. The Republic of Argentina
Nos. 10 Civ. 4101, 10 Civ. 4782
Pablo Alberto Varela v. The Republic of Argentina
No. 10 Civ. 5338
Olfant Fund, Ltd. v. The Republic of Argentina
No. 10 Civ. 9587

Dear Judge Griesa:

This firm represents plaintiffs Aurelius Capital Master, Ltd., ACP Master, Ltd., Aurelius Opportunities Fund II, LLC, and Blue Angel Capital I LLC, and we write on behalf of plaintiffs in all of the above-referenced cases ("Plaintiffs") in response to the

Honorable Thomas P. Griesa

- 2 -

October 20, 2014

letter of Friday, October 17, 2014 to Your Honor from counsel for Citibank, N.A. (“Citibank”).

The Citibank letter creates unnecessary complexity. On September 26, 2014, Your Honor entered an order (the “September 26 Order”) which establishes a clear framework for what the parties need to do. Your Honor will recall that on September 23, 2014, Citibank had moved by order to show cause to vacate the Court’s July 28, 2014 Order or to modify the injunction contained in that order (the “Citibank Motion”). The September 26 Order – which was entered at Plaintiffs’ request and with their consent – defers the hearing on the Citibank Motion, allows further briefing on the motion, and allowed Citibank to process the September 30 payment on the U.S. Dollar-denominated Argentine law bonds. The Court also allowed a 30-day period for discovery relating to the Citibank Motion.

Plaintiffs served discovery requests on Citibank, the Republic and various non-parties. The Republic served discovery requests on Plaintiffs. Our discovery is targeted on issues concerning the Citibank Motion. The discovery parties are currently engaged in a meet-and-confer process, and our hope is that these matters can be resolved without burdening the Court.

With respect to the briefing schedule, we do not understand why Citibank would write to the Court before discussing a schedule with Plaintiffs. All parties agree that the schedule should enable the Court to hear and resolve the Citibank Motion without undue time pressure before the December 31 payment date on the U.S. Dollar-denominated Argentine law bonds.

Instead of the back-and-forth briefing proposed by Citibank, Plaintiffs believe that the simplest and most appropriate course at this time – since the parties did file briefs on the Citibank Motion in advance of September 26 – is to set one date, such as November 25, for the filing of any supplemental briefs regarding the Citibank Motion. We believe that simultaneous briefs make sense here because these briefs are supplemental to the briefs that have already been submitted on the Citibank Motion. There can then be a hearing the week of December 1 or such other date as is convenient for the Court.

Honorable Thomas P. Griesa

- 3 -

October 20, 2014

Finally, our non-response to various of Citibank's assertions, including arguments it makes regarding the scope of the injunction and burden of proof, should not be construed as acquiescence. These are matters on which we strongly disagree and that the parties will be addressing in their supplemental briefs to Your Honor.

Respectfully yours,

Edward A. Friedman

Edward A. Friedman

cc: (by email, without enclosures)
Carmine D. Boccuzzi, Jr., Esq.
Karen E. Wagner, Esq.
Robert A. Cohen, Esq.
Kevin S. Reed, Esq.
Michael C. Spencer, Esq.
Leonard F. Lesser, Esq.